

that was discussed during the interview and submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests a phone call if the Examiner thinks there are any further issues that might delay issuance. Applicant greatly appreciates

- 5 Examiner Lin's willingness to assist Applicant in advancing prosecution.

### **Claim Objections**

The Office objects to claims 2-12, 23-26, 37-38, and 40-43, and suggests that Applicant amend these claims to recite "The" instead of "A" in order to

- 10 clarify its dependency on prior claimed subject matter. In the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant amends these claims as suggested by the Office, and respectfully requests that these objections be withdrawn.

Similarly, the Office objects to claims 14-21 and 28-35, and suggests that Applicant amend these claims to recite "The one or more" instead of "One or

- 15 more" in order to clarify its dependency on prior claimed subject matter. In the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant amends these claims as suggested by the Office, and respectfully requests that these objections be withdrawn.

### **§101 Rejections**

- 20 Claims 1-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 "because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter". (*Office Action*, page 3).

With regards to claims 1-12 and 22-26, Applicant amends claim 1 to recite "obtaining a task sequence at the device" and "generating a job tree at the device".

- Examiner Lin indicated, during the interview, that this amendment would  
25 overcome the rejection of claim 1. Claims 2-12 are rejected for depending from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §101 rejection of claims 1-12 be withdrawn. Similarly, Applicant amends claim 22 to recite "obtaining a user-defined task sequence at the device" and "converting, at the device". Examiner Lin indicated, during the interview, that this amendment would

overcome the rejection of claim 22. Claims 23-26 are rejected for depending from claim 22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §101 rejection of claims 22-26 be withdrawn.

Claims 13-21 and 27-35 stand rejected under §101 as being directed to 5 “communications media” which includes data signals such as carrier waves. (*Office Action*, page 4). Applicant submits that claims 13 and 27 are directed to “computer readable *storage* media” which does not include “communication media”, as discussed at pages 116-117 of Applicant’s specification. Applicant amends dependent claims 14-21 and 29-35 to recite “computer readable *storage* 10 media”. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §101 rejection of claims 13-21 and 27-35 be withdrawn.

Claims 36-38 stand rejected under §101 for reciting “means for” limitations, “which in view of the specification may be implemented in software”. (Office Action, page 5). In the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant 15 amends claim 36 by removing the “means for” limitations and to recite “a processor; and a memory embodying instructions configured to”, and respectively requests that the §101 rejection of claims 36-38 be withdrawn.

Claims 39-43 stand rejected under §101 for lacking “the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 20 35 U.S.C. §101.” (*Office Action*, page 5). In the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant amends claim 39 to recite “a controller, configured to be implemented at least in part by at least one of one or more processors” and “a network boot service, configured to be implemented at least in part by at least one of the one or more processors”, and respectively requests that the §101 rejection of claims 39- 25 43 be withdrawn in view of these amendments.

### **§ 112 Rejections**

Claims 36-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant amends claim 36 by removing the “means for” limitations, and respectively requests that the §112 rejection of claims 36-38 be withdrawn.

5

### **§ 102 Rejections**

Claims 1, 3, 6-13, 16-22, 24-30, 32-36, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,367,017 to Maddocks et al. (“Maddocks”).

As discussed above, and during the interview, all of the claims are  
10 allowable over the references of record and are in condition for allowance.

### **§ 103 Rejections**

Claims 2, 5, 14-15, 23, 31, and 37 stand rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maddocks in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0191014 to  
15 Hsieh et al. (“Hsieh”).

As discussed above, and during the interview, all of the claims are allowable over the references of record and are in condition for allowance.

**Conclusion**

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowability. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

5

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: January 22, 2009

10

By: /Mark F. Niemann/

Mark F. Niemann  
Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby  
Reg. No. 61,817  
(509) 755-7259